

fails to teach each element of claim 1. Specifically, as mentioned above, the applied art fails to teach a warp preventing sheet bonded to and entirely covering an other surface of a semiconductor chip. Further, the applied art fails to teach end surfaces of the warp preventing sheet being flush with corresponding end surfaces of the semiconductor chip. In other words, the warp preventing sheet has the same size and shape as the semiconductor chip. As a result, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2-5 and 7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Semba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,127). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Senba discloses a semiconductor packing stack module that has carrier substrates 2 and LSI chips 1 alternately stacked one onto another. However, the substrates 2 are larger than the LSI chips 1, so that their end surfaces are not flush with each other.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is improper because the applied art fails to teach each element of claim 1. Specifically, the applied art fails to teach end surfaces of a warp preventing sheet being flush with corresponding end surfaces of a semiconductor chip. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly-added claim 8 also includes features not shown in the applied art. Specifically, neither Morrell nor Senba teach or suggest a substrate and a warp preventing sheet being fabricated from different materials and a substrate thickness of the substrate and a warp preventing sheet thickness of the warp preventing sheet being

different from each other yet respective ones of at least one of the coefficients of elasticity and coefficients of thermal expansion are equal to each other.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 31, 2003

By:



Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Appendix I (Marked-Up Version of Amended Claim)

DC117110

APPENDIX I

(MARKED-UP VERSION OF AMENDED CLAIM)

1. (Amended) A semiconductor device comprising:
a substrate;
a semiconductor chip having one surface bonded to a surface of the substrate; and
a warp preventing sheet bonded to and entirely covering the other surface of the semiconductor chip, wherein
end surfaces of the warp preventing sheet are flush with corresponding end surfaces of the semiconductor chip.